



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXII, 1.

WHOLE No. 125.

I.—VAHLEN'S ENNIUS.¹

On September 27 last Johannes Vahlen celebrated his eightieth birthday. In Germany a committee of his "Freunde, Schüler und Verehrer" had been formed to do him honor, and had invited the lovers of the Classics everywhere to contribute to a fund to aid in this purpose.

I had long planned to discuss at least a part of the second edition of Vahlen's Ennius, but divers things had postponed the realization of the project. I hope that the timeliness of the present examination, if I may intrude a word borrowed from journalism within the precincts of classical scholarship, will offset the long gap between the appearance of the book and the present review. Besides, most of the topics treated in this paper are of perennial interest to the serious student of things Roman.²

In 1854 Vahlen, then twenty-four years old, issued a collection of the fragments of Ennius; in 1903, *aetate provectus*, he set forth the ripe results of nearly half a century of further study of the same author. It goes without saying that the new edition does not merely expand the old: it is essentially a different book.³

¹ Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae. Iteratis curis recensuit Iohannes Vahlen. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner (1903). Pp. ccxiv + 306. 16 marks.

² I know of no searching review of the book in English or German. Skutsch's article on Ennius in Pauly-Wissowa 5, 2589-2628 has Vahlen's book ever in mind; the present paper, however, does not cross that article at many points, and even in those is wholly independent thereof.

³ A most excellent way of realizing how far apart the two editions are is to compare the Index Sermonis of the new with the Index Verborum of the old; one sees thus how widely Vahlen's later groupings of the fragments differ at times from his earlier combinations. The changes in his views concerning the groupings involved great changes in the Prolegomena of the later book.

In 1854 Vahlen could write justly enough in his Praefatio that there was then "vix ulla editio Ennii quae desiderio paullo severiori satis facere possit". Only thrice before that year had scholars attempted to edit all the Ennian fragments together. In 1564 the Stephani had brought out a collection of fragments of Ennius, Pacuvius, Accius, etc., etc. In 1590 Hieronymus Columna published the fragments of Ennius by themselves. The work showed industry, knowledge of Ennius's language, and skill in the interpretation of individual lines. But inevitably, in the absence of the proper subsidia (see below), the text was often defective. Finally, Columna made no attempt to combine the fragments into coherent groups of verses, a grievous shortcoming, to Vahlen's mind. In 1707 Hessel brought out a Variorum revision and amplification of Columna's edition. Of these works, as of the labors of various scholars on *parts* of Ennius, Vahlen wrote in the original book, pages v-vii; he speaks of them at greater length in the later work, cxxxi-cxxxv. Especially interesting in the latter account is what is said (cxxxiv) of the stimulus given to Ennian studies by Ritschl; surely pardonable to a senex saepissime a viris laudandis laudatus is the reproduction of the praise heaped by the Senate of the University of Bonn on Vahlen's studies in the *Annales of Ennius* (1852) presented in competition for a prize which, at Ritschl's suggestion, the University had offered for work in Ennius. In 1852 came, also, Ribbeck's *Fragmenta Tragicorum Romanorum*.

Such was the material bearing directly on Ennius, meager enough, certainly, available to Vahlen in 1854. He was further handicapped by the lack of suitable editions of a host of authors with whom his Ennian studies forced him to deal. Since 1854 Vahlen himself has repeatedly written on the fragments of Ennius (see the list on page cxxxvi). In 1884 L. Müller published his *Einleitung in das Studium der römischen Poesie*; in 1885 he brought out his *Q. Ennii Carminum Reliquiae*. Of these works Vahlen has no high opinion, an estimate with which, so far as the treatment of the text is concerned, I have some sympathy; in other respects Vahlen, I think, undervalues Müller's work. In 1897 Ribbeck's book reached a third edition. As the result of these and many other works there was an ever increasing mass of material bearing directly on Ennius; of all this notice is taken, so far as one man could have taken it in one book, in the work before us.

Again, in 1854, as already said, Vahlen had not at his command trustworthy printed editions of books indispensable to the critical student of Ennius.¹ Of great importance, then, for his later work were the labors, after 1854, of divers scholars on the *Grammatici Latini*, Festus, Gellius, Macrobius, Nonius, Servius, etc., eye on the text of Cicero himself.² In 1854 Vahlen carried a heavy burden well-nigh alone; in his advancing years he might have felt that the very subsidia which from one point of view rendered his continuing labors on Ennius easier and his results surer were, by their very multiplicity and complexity, too huge a task for any single man. Yet he persevered and gave us such a presentation of Ennius's life and works, of the part he has played in the intellectual consciousness of the race from his own day to modern times, of the labors of a host of scholars on this striking personality as only one possessed of splendid powers of body and mind alike, of unflagging devotion, of dauntless courage in a huge task could have produced.

Here, surely, is matter to stir the pulse. Again, the reading of Vahlen's account of studies in Ennius by himself and other scholars and of the subsidia of the later book gives one a very real and fascinating history of three score important years in classical scholarship. It is hard to realize to-day how little in some respects the scholars of sixty years ago had at command; Vahlen's narrative brings this home with striking force; it makes us realize, also, how prolific of vital work the last six or seven decades have been.

Finally, Vahlen's narrative helps us to appreciate the importance of work on the fragments of early Latin literature. It is easy to think of such work as unimportant, as inevitably dry-as-dust; yet constructive labors in this field demand, beside other powers, fine imaginative insight controlled by sound logical sense. The work of Ribbeck and Vahlen on the fragments of early Latin made clear the imperative need of authoritative editions of a host of authors who had theretofore lain more or less without the ken of classical scholars. Hence the fruit of Vahlen's labors of a lifetime on Ennius are to be sought not merely in the fine volume before us, but also in the great host of studies on those Latin authors whose names recur so frequently in the testimonia of his Ennius.

¹ See the first edition, vii ff., the later, cxxxvii.

² See the later edition, cxxxviii-cxliii.

Space does not permit me to compare, or rather to contrast, the two editions throughout. To what I have said on this point (page 1) I may add a detail or two. The 332 pages of the first edition have been expanded into 530 larger pages in the second; xciv pages of Prolegomena have become ccxxiv; the 238 pages devoted to text and notes, the Index Verborum, and two short special Indexes have been enlarged to 306 pages of similar matter. The Prolegomena of the original book consisted almost wholly of Quaestiones Ennianaë, in eight chapters, dealing with the contents of the various books and justifying the assignment of fragments to certain places. In the new book the title Quaestiones Ennianaë is dropped, but the same general matters are treated in Part II of the Prolegomena, called *De Libris Ennianis*; a new section entitled *Historia Ennii* is prefixed to this (for its contents see below, pages 5-14). The old book showed the Latin text of the fragments, testimonia and notes on the same page; the new book retains this arrangement.

A more detailed statement of the contents of the new edition is as follows: (1) a Praefatio, pages iii-ccxxiv; (2) the text of the *Annales*, with full citations of the ancient passages in which the fragments have been preserved, and brief notes, 1-117; (3) the text, etc., of the *Scenica*, 118-203; (4) the text, etc., of the *Saturae*, 204-211; (5) the text, etc., of *Varia* (Scipio, Epigrammata, Sota, Protrepticus, Hedyphagetica, Epicharmus, Euhemerus), 212-229; (6) text, etc., of *Incerta*, 230-239; (7) *Versus falsi ex Pauli Merulae fontibus ducti*, 240-242; (8) *Index Testium*, 243-256; (9) *Index Sermonis*, 257-299; (10) *Addenda et Corrigenda*, 300-306. There is, however, no *Index Rerum*, a lack to be regretted in view of the wide array of topics covered by the Praefatio.¹

The massive Praefatio falls into two parts. In one the author

¹ Cross-references, too, are none too plentiful. To be sure the titles at the tops of the pages of the Praefatio aid the reader in finding topics, but often cross-references would greatly help the busy student, e. g., on iv to cxcvi-cxcvii; on xii, bottom, to lvi; on xiii (to explain "suo loco exponam"); on xvi (to explain "vidimus victoriam . . . secutum" and "plane ut Naevium Cicero testatur"); on xxi, first line; on xxvii (to explain "Sed de ea re . . . agetur"); xxvii (to explain the first full paragraph, end, a reference to page 43 might well be added); so on page 43 a reference back to xxvii would be useful. On lxxxvi we need, surely, a reference to the masterly discussion of Gellius 2. 29 on ccxi ff. I miss the helping references in these and other places all the more because this sort of aid is often given.

aims to give a complete "historiam Ennii ab ipsius initiis usque ad hunc librum editum" (iii); in the other he deals with Ennius's writings. The earlier part occupies pages iii-cxlv and contains, aside from a brief discussion of Ennius's life (iii-xix), an examination or at least a reference to nearly everything worth mentioning that was said about Ennius down to the time of Isidorus. There is also a brief indication of comment on him in the Middle Ages and later. A good bibliography of Ennius could be constructed from these pages. If the book contained nothing but this, its author would have deserved supremely well of Latin literature; it is of immense value, in these crowded days, to have a piece of work done so well and accurately that no one will need to do it again.

Though Vahlen is professedly concerned only with Ennius, there is an array of important observations about many other ancient writers whom he considers in his study of the numerous sources of our knowledge of Ennius. With some, perhaps many, of these observations other scholars will not be in full sympathy, but they will none the less learn much, not only in the domain of fact and inference, but, more important still, in the sphere of method.

Let us analyze now in detail the *Historia Ennii* (iii ff.). At once, after *testimonia de nominibus Ennii* have been cited, we come upon most interesting matter. That Ennius talked of himself in his *Saturae* one fragment at least makes plain. This, cited twice by Nonius from Ennius, *Saturae* III, is thus given by Vahlen on page 205:¹

Enni poeta salve, qui mortalibus
versus propinas flammeos medullitus.

Whether, as Vahlen thinks, some one is (apostrophizing or) addressing the poet, or, as I would suggest as also possible, the poet is apostrophizing himself, we have the poet's personality injected into the *Saturae*.

If the words *numquam poetor nisi <si>podager* (Sat. 64²), cited by Priscianus merely as from Ennius, are rightly assigned by Vahlen and Müller (73) to the *Saturae*, we have the same phenomenon a second time. On this basis our author writes

¹ So also Müller gives it, *Q. Enni Carminum Reliquiae*, 74 (cited hereafter merely as Müller). Merrill, *Fragments of Roman Satire*, p. 7, prints above this fragment the following words: "A conversation opens between the poet and a reader".

² I cite Ennius normally by Vahlen's titles and verse-numbering.

(iii): "probabile est eum plura de vita sua ac moribus perstrinxisse". Parallel is the famous epitaph said to have been written by Ennius in his old age for his own bust:

Aspicite, o cives, senis Enni imaginis formam, etc.¹

Next Vahlen cites Gellius's statement (17. 21. 43) that Varro in primo de poetis libro gave the year of Ennius's birth, with the further memorandum that eum (= Ennium), cum septimum et sexagesimum annum haberet, duodecimum Annalem scripsisse idque ipsum Ennium in eodem libro dicere. He thinks that Varro undoubtedly noted what Ennius had said concerning himself in his writings, because (1) Varro was to later writers their chief authority concerning Ennius, (2), according to Gellius, Varro cited concerning Naevius also what Naevius had said about himself.

Now, in 1886, in his Ueber die Annalen des Ennius, 10 ff., Vahlen had held that Annales 12 was largely autobiographical in character and had in consequence assigned to that book, without warranty from ancient testimonia, various extant fragments bearing on Ennius's life and personality. The argument for this procedure is summed up on pages cxcvi-cxcvii of our Praefatio, as follows.

In 6. 1. 23 Macrobius cites the famous

unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem

from Ennius Annales 12 (says Vahlen).² If I understand Vahlen rightly, he lays much stress here on *nobis* as proving that again in Book 12 Ennius was speaking of himself. But two remarks at least are pertinent. First, there is no sure proof that this passage belongs to 12 at all; see below, footnote 2. Secondly, how precarious Vahlen's reasoning is may be seen by considering Vergil's

¹ Vahlen has no doubt, here or on xvii, that Ennius wrote this epitaph. But L. Müller, Philologus 43. 104, refuses to believe that Ennius wrote these verses. In his edition of the fragments (page 153, under testimonium xlvii) he assigns them to Octavius Lampadio or Q. Vargunteius; see further his note on this passage on pages 247-248. Schanz³, too, is sceptical: see viii. 1. 1, page 122 (s. v. Epigramme), and page 112 (under *i*). Dougan, on Cicero Tusc. 1. 34, is disinclined to interpret *senis* as denoting actual old age.

² Eyssenhardt (Teubner text, 1868), gives this as from Book 12, after P. Vahlen, page 66, says the Salisb. MS gives vii, not xii. Müller, 36, had put this passage in Book 8.

use of this very passage. In Aeneid 6. 845-846 he makes Anchises say

tu Maximus ille es
unus qui nobis cunctando restituit rem.

Suppose we had of Vergil only fragments: how wide of the mark we should be should we infer that in Aeneid 6 Vergil had written definitely of himself! The *nobis* of the Ennian fragment has no compelling suggestion of the sort Vahlen found in it, admitting that it does indeed belong to Annales 12.

If, then, we would keep our feet on the ground, we have in Gellius alone, if anywhere, categoric proof that Ennius introduced biographical material in Annales 12; Vahlen's 'Combination' is no more successful than such Combinationen are wont to be.¹

Having concluded, however, that in Annales 12 Ennius had written of Fabius and of himself, Vahlen constructs (cxcvii) a theory of the contents of that book which shall explain the incorporation therein of these two themes; he holds that the book was a terminal book, closing one edition of the Annales.² In such a book, indeed, Ennius might have talked at will of himself and of his times, ranging widely over as many years and naming as many heroes as he saw fit.

On the basis of this argument, precarious enough, surely, Vahlen puts in Book 12, beside other things, the following: (1) a verse praising M'. Curius; (2) the famous words in which Ennius compares himself in his old age to a retired race horse;³

¹ Skutsch, 2608, I find, had anticipated my arguments, in part only, however. I find, too, that he had anticipated my own belief that the reading xii in Gellius 17. 21. 43 cannot possibly be right (numerals are notoriously liable to error in our MSS).

² Müller, Quintus Ennius, 128 ff., argued that there were four editions of the Annales, one of six books, one of fifteen, one of sixteen, one of eighteen. Teuffel-Schwabe (I cite Warr's translation, 1891), § 101. 3, had a theory of successive editions ("in series of six respectively of three books [?]", a sentence which is gibberish as it stands: I take it to be meant for "in six series of three books each"), which made 12 a terminal book. Schanz³, VIII. 1. 1, § 117, discusses "Die successive Entstehung der Annalen"; he, too, makes 12 a terminal book, apparently led to do so by Vahlen's arguments. Skutsch 2607, 2610, holds different and safer views.

³ See Cicero Cato Maior 14:

Sicut fortis ecus, spatio qui saepe supremo
vicit Olumpia, nunc senio confectus quiescit.

I have long felt that *quiesco* would be a better reading, better by far; see the

(3) another verse of Ennius about himself,

Nos sumus Romani qui fuimus ante Rudini,

which he had formerly set in Book 18. But none of these passages is assigned by any *ancient* authority to a specific book. In so far as Book 12 contained talk by Ennius about himself, continues Vahlen, it was the prototype of Horace Epp. 1. 20. 19 cum tibi sol tepidus, etc.

All this is wonderfully ingenious, especially the comparison of Book 12 and Horace Epistle 1. 20 (I may add that, were it possible to prove the justice of this comparison, we should have Horace turning in the epilogue of his first book of Epistles to Ennius as his exemplar in expressing his sense of his own achievements exactly as he had done in the epilogue to Carmina I-III). But Vahlen has not demonstrated the truth of his comparison; indeed, in the present state of our knowledge, such proof is impossible.¹

Let us consider the matter further. If we are to find support, with Vahlen and Bailey, for Vahlen's view of Annales 12 in the definite "assignation" (Bailey) of certain fragments to that book (I have already denied that such "assignation" is ancient), what are we to say of the very definite ascription by Gellius 12. 4. 1 ff. to Book VII of the famous passage in which Ennius describes a *quidam amicus Servili*, with the further positive assertion (§ 5) that L. Aelium Stilonem dicere solitum ferunt Q. Ennium de semet ipso haec scripsisse picturamque istam morum et ingenii ipsius Q. Ennii factam esse? We may indeed with Vahlen (p. 43) dismiss Gellius's testimony by saying that it merely shows "quam creduli fuerint aut arguti vel Varronis

context. This emendation must surely have made its way into print somewhere, though I have not seen it mentioned. It had occurred independently, I may add, to my colleague Professor Earle.

¹ Mr. Cyril Bailey, however, in *The Classical Review* 18. 170, is inclined to accept Vahlen's combination. Müller, *Quintus Ennius*, 125, has some sound remarks (unfortunately marred by personalities) on the difficulty of grouping at all the extant verses of the Annales. For some admirable comments on this general subject, with demonstration of the futility of certain efforts of this sort in connection with Greek comedy (the fragments of Cratinus), see pages 32-33 of *Addresses and Essays* by the late Professor Morris Hickey Morgan.

aetate priscorum poetarum interpretes",¹ but such assertion is not proof, and is of a piece with that curious tendency which scholars have long shown to cite Gellius with reverence when he supports their theories and to wave him aside when he is a stumbling block to their combinations. But if Gellius is to be set aside here, then his no more precise or positive statement about Book 12 in 17. 21. 43 must also be discarded and Vahlen's argument about Book 12, so laboriously constructed, is wholly without foundation.

My own view is this. Ennius, a strong and vital personality, a man conscious of his powers and of his mission, given to the expression of his literary self-consciousness, was likely to speak of himself anywhere in his writings, much as two kindred spirits of later times, Lucilius and Horace, more than once spoke of themselves. We have positive evidence, not yet disproved and not to be set aside by any *ipse dixit*, that he did so in two different books of the *Annales*.² Till that evidence is disproved, any attempt to group in a single book any large collection of autobiographical allusions is foredoomed to failure.³

Next Vahlen discusses the year of Ennius's birth (v-vi), the year of his death (vi-vii),⁴ his birthplace (vii-ix). All ancient

¹ Sellar, *Roman Poets of the Republic*, 72-74, Ribbeck, *Römische Dichtung*, I. 38-39, Duff, *A Literary History of Rome*, 140, find no trouble in accepting Gellius's statement. Müller, 191, *Quintus Ennius*, 68-70, would not definitely commit himself. Schanz³, VIII. I. I, § 36, λ, is sceptical.

² Schanz, page 110 (s. v. *Biographisches*), speaks similarly, though with much less detail.

³ Such an attempt is mistaken, I think, in another way; it involves the assumption, by implication at least, that each book was an artistic whole, from which matter not strictly germane to the theme immediately in hand was excluded. We do not by any means know that such an assumption is well-founded.

⁴ Vahlen makes no comment here or elsewhere (e. g., on page 210) on the *cause* of Ennius's death. Jerome says he died *articulari morbo*. Priscianus cites a verse from Ennius himself (Vahlen, *Sat.* 64) which some regard as bearing on this matter: *Numquam poetor nisi <si> podager*. By this verse many scholars have been reminded of Horace *Epp.* I. 19. 7:

Ennius ipse pater numquam nisi potus ad arma
prosiliit dicenda.

Now to me nothing can be clearer than that the Horatian passage as a whole (1-18) is not to be taken too seriously. Schanz, however (p. 110), treats it with desperate seriousness. He regards the famous passage from the *Annales* preserved by Gellius 12. 4 (see above, page 8) as indeed a "Charakterbild"

testimony, right and wrong both, is considered. The implications of the last-named theme, however, are not followed up. Of what nationality was Ennius? What of the bearing of the Greek character of Apulia (Messapia) on Ennius's career? what of the *tria corda* matter, so lightly disposed of on page iv? in what order did Ennius master the three languages he knew and what is the significance of that order? perhaps no positive answer to these questions can be given, but they should at least be asked.¹

Vahlen would like to trace to Ennius himself the story given by Nepos, Cato 1. 4, that Cato as quaestor brought Ennius to Rome from Sardinia; Ennius, he thinks, might have mentioned the fact at the end of *Annales* 12 (as in Epp. 1. 20 Horace men-

of Ennius, drawn, however, by Aelius Stilo, not by Ennius himself, as Gellius avers. He then proceeds; "Nur ein Zug ist vergessen, den uns Horaz aufbewahrt hat, dass nämlich Ennius den Becher liebte und denselben gern leerte, ehe er zur Arbeit schritt. Ennius starb im Jahre 169 am Podagra". Müller, too (Quintus Ennius, 67), takes Horace literally and traces Ennius's gout to his love of strong drink. So, too, Skutsch, 2592, who suggests that Horace drew his information about Ennius in this connection from Ennius's own *Saturae*. So again Tyrrell, *Anthology of Latin Poetry*, p. 206 (note on xiv, 7); he is similarly over-sober in his *Latin Poetry*, 188, 195. Sellar, *Roman Poets of the Republic*, 72, wrote more wisely of Horace's "humorous exaggeration". So, too, Müller, *Quintus Ennius*, 108, forgetting what he had written on page 67 of the same book, as given already in this note, saw the truth in part, though he mixed absurdity with the truth, in describing Ennius's verse cited above "als eine, natürlich scherzhafte, Entschuldigung, dass der Dichter, auch nachdem er römischer Bürger geworden, doch nicht abstehe Verse zu machen". I note that Ennius, in the verse in question, says nothing himself about drinking. Even in ancient days, we may now believe, gout and high living or much drinking did not necessarily stand in causal sequence. I cannot help wondering that no German scholar has attempted as yet, in the spirit of Leo's efforts to explain away in his *Plautinische Forschungen* the traditional accounts of the lives of Naevius and Plautus as due in part to efforts to gain analogues to traditional accounts of Greek writers, to show that the reference to Ennius's gout by Jerome is based merely on the Horatian passage and this in turn on an importation into Ennius's life of notorious traits of Cratinus, of whom Horace is thinking so much in the whole passage.

¹ For discussions of them see Ribbeck, *Römische Tragödie*, 77; Müller, *Quintus Ennius*, 62; Duff, *A Literary History of Rome*, 136; Schanz³, pp. 109-110, 111 (under *ϕ*), and, best of all, Skutsch, 2589-2590. I may cite here a remark of Mr. Bailey concerning the book under review (*The Classical Review* 18. 169): "Little will be found in the way of comment on the style and thought or historical accuracy of Ennius; but almost every possible detail, on which such comment may be based".

tioned his own campaigning). But he admits that this is speculation and that there are difficulties in Nepos's story.

On page x Vahlen takes up the ancient tale that Ennius lived on the Aventine, in poverty, with but one ancilla. The story is found only in Jerome, but from Jerome, says Vahlen, we get back to Suetonius, Nepos, Cicero, Varro, and thence to autobiographical matter by Ennius himself (though for autobiographical matter on this point, whose existence is hinted at rather than asserted, no evidence at all is given, aside from a reiteration of the belief (see above, p. 6) that Varro was familiar with all the autobiographical matter in Ennius). If now, he continues, we recall what Festus says (492. 22 Th.) about the grant of the aedes Minervae as a meeting place for *scribae* and *histriones*, we understand why tradition made Ennius live on the Aventine. Jerome's story Vahlen refers to Ennius's early years in Rome, when he gained his living by teaching.¹ He remembers that Cicero says in Cato Maior 14 that Ennius was poor in his old age, but, following again his more or less eclectic policy with respect to the sources, he is disinclined to accept Cicero's testimony. The tradition about the ancilla he traces to the story in Cicero De Oratore 2. 276 concerning Nasica, Ennius and an ancilla; the story may have been told, he thinks, by Ennius himself "in satura aut nescio quo carmine". Having but one slave (or but few slaves), he says, was a "vulgare indicium paupertatis"; he compares Seneca ad Helviam 12. 4 unum fuisse Homero servum, tres Platoni, nullum Zenoni satis constat, and Terence Haut. 293.²

¹ So Schanz, p. 110; cf. Skutsch, 2590.

² I may add Horace Serm. 1. 3. 11-12 (about Hermogenes Tigellius) and Serm. 1. 6. 116 (about himself). In 1895 Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, 67, anticipated part of Vahlen's present criticism of this story. Schanz, § 36, 7, is not convinced by Leo and Vahlen. I may note that there is nothing whatever in Cicero De Oratore 2. 276 to show that Ennius was then poor; not more than one ancilla could well have figured in such a tale, however many slaves Ennius might have had. The argument from Festus's reference to the aedes Minervae is inconclusive; we might fairly urge that one seeking to live by literature at all would naturally fix his abode in the vicinity of the meeting place of the poets. Schanz, too, § 36, 7, doubts the statement in Cicero Cato Maior 14; I need not say, however, that poverty in old age is not incompatible with happier circumstances in earlier days. Ennius outlived his friend Scipio by many years, as Vahlen notes in another connection. If Ennius was poor at any time during his life at Rome, it was, I think, either in

Next Ennius's friendship with Scipio is considered (xii-xiii). Then Vahlen notes that, though Ennius praises Cato, he cannot have been intimate with the censor (in spite of Cicero Cato Maior 10); they were too much unlike and Cato was the enemy of Ennius's friend Scipio. He thinks, further, that Cato's criticism of Fulvius because he took Ennius with him on his campaign to Aetolia is evidence that Cato was not especially friendly, to say the least, to Ennius. But this inference is not inevitable; it is likely enough that Cato's game was Fulvius rather than Ennius (cf. Cicero Tusc. 1. 2). Cato's criticism of Fulvius, continues Vahlen, proves that Ennius did not go with Fulvius to fight, for to that Cato could not have taken exception. Hence, in using *militarat*, in Brutus 79, of Ennius's activities in Aetolia, Cicero was much less exact than he was in Pro Archia 11 about Archias (xix, note 2).¹ Finally, Vahlen approves Ribbeck's suggestion that Ennius's Ambracia dealt with the capture of the city of that name by Fulvius, though, he admits, nothing in the few fragments of the piece proves this. He does not notice Müller's suggestion (Quintus Ennius, 61; cf. Mommsen, R. G. 1⁸. 801) that Ennius took the praenomen Quintus to please the son of Fulvius, to whom he owed citizenship.

Our author holds (xvi) that Ennius spent all his years at Rome in writing. We can seldom tell, however, in what order he produced his works. The Scipio, it is reasonable to suppose, came shortly after the battle of Zama;² so the Ambracia would have come most fittingly immediately after Fulvius's triumph in 187. According to Varro ap. Gell. 17. 21. 43 Ennius was writing *Annales* 12 in 172.³ From all this Vahlen concluded in 1886

his first days there, before he had won powerful patrons, or in his last days, when those patrons were dead. (Professor Sihler, in his paper on *The Collegium Poetarum* at Rome, A. J. P. XXVI 4 ff., emphasizes the poverty of poetæ and scribae). From the fact that Ennius got citizenship from the son of Fulvius, one may, perhaps, conclude that Ennius outlived another patron of his middle life, the elder Fulvius. Skutsch, 2590, thinks these stories of Ennius's poverty may well go back to autobiographical passages in Ennius's writings.

¹ Aurelius Victor De Vir. Ill. 52 was much more exact. On the general points involved see Müller, Quintus Ennius, 66; Schanz, p. 110; Skutsch 2591. I may add that at the time of Fulvius's campaign Ennius was fifty years old, and so beyond the normal fighting age.

² Skutsch, 2599, is less precise; he merely says the Scipio must have preceded the *Annales*.

³ But see above, page 7, especially note 1.

that Ennius did not begin his *Annales* till 184, and that he was busy on them till he died (as Naevius wrote his *Bellum Punicum* in his old age: Cicero *Cato Maior* 50). Vahlen adds now that in *Annales* IX Ennius praises the Consul Cethegus in terms which imply that Cethegus belonged to a period earlier by twenty-five years, more or less, than the time of writing. Cethegus was consul in 194. It may perhaps be captious to note that twenty-five years would bring Book 9 down to 169, a period three years later than that so often insisted on by our author for Book 12. In Book 12, continues Vahlen, Ennius confesses that he is old; again, in the first line of his famous epitaph, which contains a direct reference to the *Annales*, he describes himself as *senex*. I fail to see the force of this last point. If we accept the epitaph as by Ennius himself (see above, page 6, note 1), it still need not *per se* prove at all that the *Annales* and the epitaph were contemporaneous. In writing his epitaph in advanced age a man might look back over many years to work done long before.

Before 184, says Vahlen, Ennius devoted himself to play writing, because thus he could most readily have earned a living. Here several things, it seems to me, are ignored. What of the evidence that Ennius was a teacher? When was this teaching done? It is surely not likely to have been done after he became a figure of consequence in the national literature. Further, was there really a good chance of supporting one's self by writing plays?¹ Not many plays, surely, can have been brought out by one man in any one year (the days of the *ludi* were not so numerous in Ennius's time); the stress laid on the sum, small enough in itself, won by Terence through his *Eunuchus* shows that the normal payments to playwrights cannot have been large. Still, as Ribbeck notes in his *Römische Tragödie*, 78, the years following the close of the Second Punic War were very favorable to the drama. We may note also that Livius Andronicus's first play(s) followed the close of the First Punic War, and that the statement commonly made that concentric sets of seats (*gradus*) in the theater date from 146 B. C. rests on no better foundation than the inference that the period of rejoicing over the fall of Corinth and Carthage would naturally have set up conditions equally or even more favorable to the production of plays.

¹ I admit that similar queries may well be put concerning the possibility of supporting one's self by teaching in Ennius's time.

Finally, although Ennius never stopped writing plays (witness his *Thyestes* in his last year), Vahlen thinks he produced most of his dramas before he began to write the *Annales*.

On pages xviii–xix Vahlen rejects the ancient story, found in varying forms in several writers, that the bust of Ennius stood on Scipio's tomb, by the latter's orders. He rejects it on the grounds, first, that the authors who first mention it do not speak categorically (cf. *putatur* in Cicero *Pro Archia* 22, and *dicuntur* in Livy 38. 56. 4), and, secondly, that Ennius died some eighteen years after Scipio.¹ The latter argument is inconclusive. Scipio, not being able to foresee how long Ennius would outlive him, might well enough (why may not the reviewer too indulge in speculation?) have asked that some memorial of his friendship with Ennius be placed on his tomb; it is not too hard to believe that even eighteen years after his death his wish—had he expressed such a wish—still carried weight with his family, a family rather tenacious of memories and customs. However, Vahlen thinks that the whole tale arose merely from the fact that Ennius was a contemporary of Scipio and had praised him; he believes rather, on the basis of a different story in Jerome, that Ennius's body was burned on the Janiculum and that his bones were sent to Rudiae. On these same pages reference is made to the intimacy of Ennius and Caecilius.

Here ends the *Vita Enni*.

Vahlen turns now to consider in great detail the attitude of other writers toward Ennius. How far do other writers cite him? In what way do they cite him? What is the value of their citations? What light do they throw on the esteem in which Ennius was held? How far do they help us to reconstruct his works or to form a conception of their arguments? These and allied questions Vahlen has ever in mind (xix–cxxxi).²

It is probable, he thinks, that Ennius knew neither Livius Andronicus nor Naevius (xix–xx). There is no sure evidence that Livius was alive after 207, the year of his poem in honor of Juno; Naevius lived on after 204, but away from Rome. Years after Naevius's death, when Ennius had got round to describing the First Punic War, he wrote harshly of Naevius, to the wrath of Cicero (*Brutus* 75), but he had then an axe to grind, in that he was seeking to show the vast distance between the rude Satur-

¹ Cf. Skutsch, 2590–2591.

² Cf. Skutsch, 2613 ff.

nians of Livius and Naevius and his own hexameters,¹ at once more ambitious in effort and more polished in fact.

Cicero, l. c., charges that Ennius after all borrowed from Naevius. The fragments show no clear light on this point. We must, however, bear in mind (xx) that both Naevius and Ennius began with Aeneas and that Ennius treated this part of his theme "non parce"; certain things (see Vahlen on Ann. 35-51, in the testimonia) make it likely that, had we both poets com-

¹ I insert here a note I have long had in mind to write. Ribbeck, *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*³, p. 5, gives at the end of his collection of the fragments of Livius Andronicus four verses which Terentianus Maurus cites as from Livius ille vetus Graio cognomine. Of these verses the first and the third are hexameters, the second and the fourth *miuri*. Marius Victorinus supports Terentianus. In his edition of the *Fragmenta* Ribbeck does not seem to doubt this testimony. In his comments on the lines he does indeed say, as his last word, this: "Laevio tribuit Scaliger: cf. mea hist. trag. Rom., p. 34 adn."; but the footnote in question contains no reference to Scaliger. In his *Römische Tragödie*, page 34, text, he discusses our verses in his treatment of Livius Andronicus; here there are notes of scepticism, as follows: "Auch die Ino des Livius Andronicus, wenn es ein solches Stück gab, muss diesen Stoff behandelt haben". In a footnote to the clause I have italicized, Ribbeck holds that we must forever remain uncertain on that point because Laevius too wrote an Ino. To this he adds nothing beyond the statement that the verses under discussion are "in offenbar modernisirter Form". Teuffel (§§ 13. 5; 94. 5) and Cruttwell (p. 38) believed unreservedly that Andronicus wrote these lines.

It has long seemed to me, independently of the attitude of others, that these lines have the appearance of being late productions. It is hard to believe that Livius could have produced verses as smooth as these or indeed that he attempted such a metrical tour de force at all. All the arguments by various scholars to the effect that the acrostic *argumenta* to the plays of Plautus must, on grounds of form alone, be assigned to a relatively late and sophisticated age apply, mutandis mutatis, to our verses.

Now, a poet Laevius flourished about 64 B. C. He is constantly confounded by the ancients "with Livius, Naevius, Lepidus, Laevinus, even with Pacuvius" (Teuffel, § 150. 4; Schanz, VIII. 1. 2, § 91). It is known that this Laevius used a wide variety of meters, among which Teuffel, l. c., names iambic dimeters, trochaics, scazons, anapaests, hexameters, phalaecians, etc. (cf. Schanz, l. c., p. 34). It would appear, also, that he wrote a work called Ino. It seems to me altogether probable that the verses in Ribbeck, cited as from an Ino of Livius, are to be ascribed rather to Laevius. I may add that *odorisequus*, found in the fourth of the verses under discussion, is precisely the sort of compound that Laevius affected (see Gellius 19. 7. 2 ff.; Schanz, p. 37). No marked compounds occur in indisputable fragments of Livius.

I find now that others have lately questioned the Livian authorship of these verses; see Duff, *A Literary History of Rome*, 125, n. 2.

plete, we should find more evidence of borrowing by the later writer. I may add that everything we know about the methods of work of Latin writers lends credibility to any statement made in ancient times that Ennius borrowed, where opportunity offered, from his predecessor.

Plautus and Ennius lived in Rome contemporaneously for over twenty years. Yet of their relations nothing is known. The Prologue of the *Poenulus* does indeed contain a reference to the Achilles Aristarchi (of Ennius), but that gives no hint of personal relations between the two men, even if this prologue is really Plautine.¹ One thing the allusion does prove; by the time this prologue was written Ennius's fame was secure: the spectators know whose play is meant, though the author is not named. Vahlen believes that he detects certain similarities in language between Plautus and Ennius (xxi, bottom)².

¹On this point Vahlen has no doubts (cf. xxi: "Plautinum enim hunc prologum esse non est quod dubitetur"); Plautine scholars, however, have held on various grounds doubts of its authenticity, at least in part: cf. e. g., Palmer, *Amphitruo*, pp. 127-128 (by implication, in what is said about fixed seats in the theater), Morris on *Captivi* 68, p. 8, and in particular Ritschl, *Parerga* 219-220, 225. I feel sorry to be obliged to record that Vahlen's pronouncements on moot matters outside of problems connected with Ennius are more than once mere obiter dicta, beset by the fatality which so often overwhelms the obiter dicta of the bench. See below, p. 23, n. 2. Still more striking is the way in which in two lines (ccxiv) he disposes of the dramatic *Satura*; see my comments in *A. J. P.* XXIX 468-469.

²Vahlen adds: "nec dubito quin aliorum diligentia plura inventura sit, sed ne ea quidem est quod alterum sumpsisse ab altero quam utrumque ex communi sermonis usu prompsisse malimus". Certainly the similarities noted by Vahlen himself are, as he admits, without significance.

I hope that an investigation which I have on hand at present, involving a search for References to Painting and Literature in Plautus and Terence, will throw brighter light on this subject. For the present I content myself with asking the reader to compare that most brilliant of all the parodies in Plautus, *Bacchides* 925-978, with Ennius *Scen.* 92 ff.; especially let him put Plautus 933

O Troia, o patria, o Pergamum, o Priame periisti senex

side by side with Ennius 92 ff.:

O pater, o patria, o Priami domus, etc.

My investigation will show clearly, I can see already, that Plautus knew contemporary and earlier tragedy well, and that he girds at it from time to time; he can hardly have left Ennius, the most successful writer of tragedy thus far, out of his ken. See *Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 41.

Caecilius and Ennius were intimates (xvii, xviii). Pacuvius, says Vahlen (xxii-xxiii), for many years "*picturam exercuit*"; he was *persenex* when he began to compose tragedies. Having cited the well-known verses,

Pacvi discipulus dicor, porro is fuit Enni,
Ennius Musarum, Pompilius clueor,

Vahlen writes thus (xxiv): "*Sed is qui se Pacuvii (Pacvi) discipulum dicit, si Pacuvium Ennii discipulum voluit ea mente qua Ennium Musarum, non est profecto quod Pacuvium vivo Ennio et eo docente tragicam artem didicisse statuamus*". This, I confess, I do not understand. He notes further that in later days Pacuvius was believed to have outshone Ennius, "*nec solum in tragoedia*". He proceeds immediately to cite allusions to Pacuvius's *Saturae*; the juxtaposition seems to imply that he would have us feel that Pacuvius surpassed Ennius in this field too. But the references cited by him surely give no color at all to such a view. Nor is the view favored by the fact that Pacuvius's *Saturae* have completely disappeared.

Of writers who were not Ennius's contemporaries Terence is the first to mention him; in *Andria* 18 ff. he names Ennius as one of those whose use of *contaminatio* justified his own practice in that regard. The circumstances under which Terence wrote this passage preclude the possibility of doubting his testimony. Yet, Vahlen maintains (xxiv), in the extant fragments of Ennius there is no hint of *contaminatio*. The claim made by some that there are traces of contamination in the *Iphigenia* Vahlen refuses to admit.¹

It is seldom that Terence seems to have Ennius in mind, says

¹ I note that, in spite of Terence's own admission that he contaminated, modern scholarship has failed to add evidences of this process from his *complete* plays. This, let me remark in passing, is the finest possible tribute to his consummate art. The absence of any real evidence of contamination in Ennius's *fragments* was to be expected, in view of the nature of the fragments, the mode of their preservation, and the fact that they were cited by ancient writers commonly to prove isolated points, not to throw general light on Ennius's writings in the large. The whole matter may serve once again to warn us how hesitant we should be to make general declarations concerning a writer on the basis of fragments only of his work. See above, p. 8, n. 1.

Vahlen. He asks us, however, to compare Syrus's words in *Adelphoe* 386 ff.

istuc est sapere, non quod ante pedes modost
videre, sed etiam illa quae futura sunt
prospicere,

with a verse in the *Iphigenia* (Scen. 244) :

Quod est ante pedes nemo spectat, caeli scrutantur plagas.

He notes that Donatus ad loc. declares that hoc sumpsit poeta de illo in physicum pervulgato ancillae dicto, and then cites the Ennius verse. I would suggest that perhaps rather both authors are drawing on a proverbial expression, similar in spirit to the parable of the mote and the beam. Again, in *Eunuchus* 590

At quem deum ! qui templa caeli summa sonitu concutit !

Donatus saw *parodia* de Ennio ; in Scen. 380 we have

qui templa caeli summa sonitu concutit.

In his Praefatio xxiv Vahlen thinks that "Terentius . . . hunc versum ita affert . . . ut se uti alieno versu indicare videatur" (something I myself quite fail to see) ; in the testimonium to Ennius's verse, however (p. 192), he says "Ennii versus fueritne talis qualem Terentius posuit dubium reddit Donati adnotatio". But it was natural for poet after poet to refer to Jupiter's thunder, and it would have been difficult to make the references much unlike. Finally, says our author, Phormio 339-340 is surely an imitation of the six verses which he has included, though very doubtfully, in the fragments of the *Saturae* (Book 6, vss. 14-19).¹

Vahlen writes next of Vargunteius's efforts to make Ennius's *Annales* better known by reading them publicly *certis diebus*, and then quotes (xxvi) Fronto's statement that L. Caelius Antipater <Ennium> aemulatus est. From this he infers (1) that Caelius read Ennius diligently, and (2) that since Cicero declares (*De Legg.* 1. 6, *De Orat.* 2. 54) that Caelius paid some heed to

¹ The investigation referred to above, on page 16, n. 2, has already shown clearly that Terence offers far less material in that connection than Plautus ; we may feel certain that his consummate sense of art prevented him from introducing matter which might seem extraneous. I may refer to my observations on the care with which Terence confines his geographical references to strictly Greek geography, made in my paper on Travel in Ancient Times as seen in Plautus and Terence, *Classical Philology*, 2. 5, n. 2.

style, "in ea re ad Ennii exemplum se composuisse". Yet, he argues, we must not read too much into Fronto's utterance; he is thinking primarily of the right choice of words.¹ Hence Vahlen differs from those who, because Livy used Caelius as one of his authorities for the Hannibalic War, whenever they see in Livy "colore quodam poetico distincta", ascribe these things at once to Caelius, as imitator Ennii, and feel that in this way they are increasing our store of fragments of Ennius.²

I must pass over Vahlen's discussion of the relation of Aelius Stilo (xxvii), Lucilius (xxvii ff.), and Lucretius (xxx) to Ennius. We turn rather to two men, contemporaries, who have done most to preserve Ennius's verses, Varro and Cicero.

Varro couples Ennius and Homer more than once; he refers to Ennius even in his *De Re Rustica*. In his *Saturae* he cited him, probably, not seldom (xxxi), a significant fact, because Varro wished his *Saturae* to be generally used; his citation of Ennius's verses without indication of authorship proves how well and widely Ennius's writings were known. A richer source, however, of verses of Ennius is the *De Lingua Latina*, especially Books 5-7, which deal with *usus sermonis*; even more fruitful is Book 8, which sets forth "propria poetarum in significandis locis ac temporibus consuetudo". But helpful as Varro is, he has his defects; he does not cite exactly with the name of the work and the number of the book whence the fragment comes; he writes rather as "homo doctus . . . doctis hominibus ex immensa copia eruditionis semper affluentis" (xxxii). Again, at times at least he is not verbally accurate (we can check some of his citations by appeal to works surviving intact). So, then, he never names the *Annales*; of course he never ascribes a fragment to a specific book of the *Annales*. The tragedies he does at times name (xxxi, xxxiv); sometimes he cites, not a play, but the name of a character in a play (xxxv). All this renders it extremely difficult to assign to their proper places the fragments of Ennius preserved for us by Varro.

Cicero (xxxix ff.) "singulari favore prosecutus est Ennium, cuius memoria dici non potest quantum debeat Ciceroni". To

¹ In a footnote Vahlen declares that he fails to find resemblances between the fragments of Caelius and those of Ennius. Cf. Skutsch, 2618.

² Vahlen declares he will discuss this point later when he comes to Livy. I shall merely say, therefore, here that I agree heartily with his position. See below, page 24.

him (and, I may add, to Gellius) we owe the long continuous passages. Again, Cicero's quotations deal mainly with matters and thoughts, not with syllables and forms; thus he indicates the connection, the context of the passages he cites, helping us to get an idea often of the argument, and, in the case of plays, even of the action.

Now, says Vahlen, Cicero was an orator heard by many, a writer who desired to be read by many. Hence his citations of Ennius prove that Ennius was a popular poet (his tragedies, we may remember, were still often seen in Cicero's time: xlix); he was reminding "*homines liberaliter instituti*" of facts and thoughts perfectly familiar to them from their own reading and from their own witnessing of plays.

Turning now to details Vahlen notes that there are not many citations from Ennius in Cicero's Orations. At once I pause to ask how this fact fits in with Vahlen's contention, just set forth, that Ennius was a well-known, much read and popular poet. There are indeed, as Vahlen reminds us, notable references to Ennius in the *Pro Archia* (xxxix-xl). But the *Pro Archia*, I would ask the reader to remember, was unique; it was addressed, not to the many, but to a small group of iudices, picked men, with a presiding officer whose culture is dwelt upon; yet even to these men Cicero is apologetic throughout with respect to culture and pure literature. We may recall with profit the fact that Cicero adopts varying tones about certain subjects, according as he talks to the populace in the open air or to the few in the Senate. In *Pro Murena* 30 he refers to Ennius, without naming him; but here again, I ask the reader to note, he is addressing a jury. Again, here, as elsewhere, Cicero converts to his own uses what Ennius had said, "*ut appareat quantum Cicero ab auditorum intelligentia exspectaret*" (xli). An examination of the *Index Testium* on pages 244 ff. fails to show any citations by Cicero from Ennius in the *Catiline Orations* or in the *Manilian Law*, orations specifically addressed to the people. We may surmise, also, that on the whole some citations from the poets in Orations were added in that revision which, as we know, Cicero gave to his speeches before they were published. It would seem to me, then, that so far as citations from Ennius in the Orations go, they prove clearly that Cicero himself knew Ennius well and that in his opinion the sort of men who served as iudices also knew the poet, but they do not prove that Ennius was known to the many.

Of Cicero's rhetorical writings the *De Oratore*—the most elaborate of them all, I may note—shows many citations from Ennius, especially in Book 3. The plan of the work makes these in general short pieces; Cicero takes for granted his reader's knowledge of the rest (xlii–xliii). Similar are the citations in the *Orator*; there are also here some general judgments of the poet, and a comparison of him with Homer. The *Brutus* gives us important *fragmenta Enniana*. All this rather confirms, I think, what I said above about the absence of citations from Ennius in the *Orations*; when Cicero is writing elaborately, to the few who have leisure to *read* as often as they will what he has said, his citations are far more numerous than they are when he is talking to the populace which must take in at a single hearing all that the orator says.¹

The philosophical works give us “*immensa copia . . . testimoniorum*” (xlvi ff.). The *Annales* Cicero very seldom names, “*quotquot versus citavit qui non possunt nisi in Annalibus locum habuisse*”. He names Ennius, occasionally the character whom the poet had represented as speaking, sometimes verses alone without name of poet or work, “*tamen non dubius haec recte ab iis quibus vult intelligi*”. “*Poetam appellat, nusquam poema, sed loquitur ut de re nota decerptis admonendi causa paucis particulis versuum ne inter se quidem connexorum*” (xlvii).²

Cicero's philosophical works, without exception, yield fragments of Ennius, but the *Tusculans* contribute most; in the *Tusculans*, by the way, he justifies, by contemporary Greek usage, the introduction of verses into philosophical discussions. These citations come particularly from the tragedies; for a list of tragedies cited by Cicero see page 1.³ Many verses, plainly tragic, are quoted without assignment to definite plays. But, says Vahlen, it was not necessary for him to name the plays “*quas nemo erat quin de scena cognitas haberet*”. He often names

¹ Nettleship, *Lectures and Essays*, Second Series, 105, 109, has well pointed out how the fact that Caesar and Cicero both were at bottom orators by training, seeking to convey instantaneously their message to people's *ears*, accounts for certain characteristics of their style, e. g., the fact that their periods are far less intricate than those of Livy, who wrote for readers.

² The longest surviving fragments of the *Annales* we owe to *De Divinatione* 1; both are cited merely as *apud Ennium*.

³ Holden, in his note on Cicero *De Officiis* 1. 114 (l. 15), had given a good list of tragedies of Ennius cited by Cicero.

rather the character whose words he is quoting. Again, he does not always quote the exact words (1, liii).¹

In Cicero's Epistles there is little of Ennius, though he is once named, "sed quae sunt aperiunt quam familiaris fuerit Ciceroni

¹ Pages xlviii-xlix bring up a matter which has long interested me. Two passages are cited there, one from *De Finibus* 1. 4, the other from *Academica* 1. 10, in which Cicero expresses somewhat different ideas concerning the way in which Ennius, Pacuvius and Accius rendered their Greek originals. In the former he implies that they wrote *fabellas ad verbum e Graecis expressas*, in the latter he says they *non verba sed vim Graecorum expresserunt poetarum*.

Vahlen does not discuss these passages. I cannot refrain from setting forth my own opinion that a comparison of the fragments of Ennius, at least, with their Greek originals, will show that Cicero's words in the *Academica* are much nearer the truth. The matter is no mere academic question; a man's attitude toward it may affect deeply his view of certain very important questions. For example, Professor M. L. Earle, in an article entitled *Studies in Sophocles's Trachinians* (*Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 33, 21-29), considered at length Cicero's translation in *Tusc.* 2. 20-22 of Sophocles's *Trachinians* 1046-1102. Professor Earle throughout tacitly assumes that Cicero was seeking to translate as literally as possible (as literally as his knowledge of Greek made possible), and so sought to determine the probable Greek original of Cicero's rendering and compared or contrasted the readings thus inferred with the *textus receptus* of Sophocles. This procedure was, to my mind, quite unjustifiable. The theory that Cicero was trying to translate as closely as possible is not the only conceivable explanation of the differences between the Latin version and the Greek original; those differences can be explained perfectly well on another theory, to wit, that Cicero was, in the language of the *Academica*, seeking to express *non verba sed vis Sophoclis*. The latter theory, in itself more natural, is made far more probable when we recall, what Professor Earle does not note at all as a factor in the problem, that Cicero was translating iambic trimeters in one language into iambic senarii in another quite different language. No one would hold Professor Earle's attitude in connection with an English hexameter translation, say, of the *Aeneid*.

I am myself thoroughly convinced that the *Academica* passage gives the truth; in *De Finibus*, l. c., Cicero held a brief, with himself as client, beset by a charge to which he was always extremely sensitive (see Dr. Reid's admirable discussion of Cicero as Man of Letters and Student of Philosophy, in his larger edition of the *Academica*, pages 1-10).

In the case of Ennius, to apply to our general subject the foregoing remarks, there is clear proof that, though he often enough misunderstood the Greek (but have not far more learned Greek scholars since his day, with far better subsidia at their command, done this?), he often departed deliberately from his originals. I cite at present but one authority—a disinterested one—on this point; see Mackail's remarks in his *Latin Literature*, p. 8, on Ennius's *Iphigenia at Aulis*.

Ennii poesis et quam non ignota iis ad quos scribit. Utitur enim Ennianis ut suae orationi leporis aliquid et facetiarum impertiat, quod placere possit iis quibuscum communicat" (liv). I note once again, however, that Cicero's correspondents were, in general, men who stood out from the common throng.

We have come by this time to the Augustan Age (lv ff.). In the last half century B. C. Ennius was less highly esteemed than he had been by Cicero. Still, Augustus, in a letter to Tiberius (Suet. Tib. 21; see Vahlen lvi), applied to Tiberius, in slightly modified form, a famous verse of Ennius, writing:

Unus homo nobis vigilando restituit rem.

Vergil¹ was deeply indebted to Ennius, if Macrobius and Servius are to be believed (see below, pages 32-34). Horace's pronouncements on Ennius vary; in at least one place, however (Serm. i. 4. 60 ff.), he speaks of him with marked respect.² Occasionally, says Vahlen, we can see traces of Ennius's verses in Horace. Still, of infelicities in Ennius Horace speaks in Serm. i. 10. 57 ff³. In Horace's time the battle between the advocates of the older and those of the newer literature was on⁴; the extravagant praise bestowed by some on Ennius Horace vigorously opposed in Epp. 2. 1. 50 ff. But this very passage and *Ars Poetica* 258 testify to Ennius's vogue; the latter also proves that Ennius's tragedies were still seen on the stage.

On page lx there is a brief treatment of Ovid's attitude toward Ennius; though he criticises the older poet as lacking in art, he none the less testifies to his vogue. Then, in a very interesting

¹ Skutsch, 2616, emphasizing the extent to which Vergil imitated Ennius, holds that precisely this fact, in view of the success of the *Aeneid*, "am meisten dazu beigetragen hat, dass die Nachfolgenden <i. e., the literary artists of the later time> mehr und mehr Geschmack und Interesse an E. verloren".

² Vahlen cites also *Carm.* 4. 8. 17-20, as evidence of Horace's respect for Ennius. Neither here nor on page xii, where he had already cited these verses, does he give any hint that he questions the authenticity of this *Ode* in whole or in part. See above, p. 16, n. 1.

³ Animadversion upon Ennius's infelicities and reproduction of some of his phrases or verses are of course not incompatible. If we need proof on this point, we may recall that, spite of his words in *Serm.* i. 10. 16-19, Horace did reproduce bits of Catullus.

⁴ See also my paper on Archaism in Aulus Gellius, in *Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler*, 135.

part of the Praefatio (lxiff.), Vahlen considers the relation of Livy to Ennius. Interwoven with this discussion is a further treatment of Ovid's relation to our poet. These themes Vahlen interlaces "ob necessitatem quam ambo (i. e. Livy and Ovid) cum Ennio habuisse creduntur".

Livy¹ mentions Ennius but twice. In 38. 56. 4 he refers to the statue in Scipionum monumento said to have been that of the poet. In 30. 26. 9, in relating the death of Q. Fabius Maximus, he says of him, nihil certius est quam unum hominem nobis cunctando rem restituisse, sicut Ennius ait. As Vahlen notes, the well-known verse Livy need not have derived directly from the Annales, particularly since "eum solutis numeris affert".

Verses of Ennius Livy does at times adapt to his own purposes. But Vahlen refuses to follow those who see (as Hug saw) whole verses transplanted bodily by Livy into his own work. Livy knew too well, says Vahlen, the dicta of the rhetoricians—e. g. Cicero—against the presence of complete verses in prose writings.²

Nor will Vahlen accept Ehwald's view that "vestigia quaedam non solum orationis sed etiam metrorum Ennianorum" are to be discovered in Livy. Ehwald compared certain verses in Ovid de excessu Romuli with utterances of Livy on the same theme, found them, he maintained, alike, and concluded that the likeness meant that both authors had imitated Ennius (lxii).

By another path scholars have sought to find vestigia Enniana in Livy, ascribing to Ennius's influence "quae numerosi quid habent aut colore poetico distincta sunt". Caelius Antipater, according to Cicero, had paid some heed to style (see above, page 18); hence these critics have held that passages in Livy that are rhythmical or poetic in coloring come ultimately from Ennius, not directly, but through Caelius. Indeed, cries Vahlen, to hear these critics talk, one would almost fancy that Caelius had written of the Hannibalic War in verse! (lxiii).

Now, if Livy did not use Caelius as his sole authority—and we know he did not—why should we ascribe to Caelius alone "quaecumque numerosi quid habere viderentur in his libris Livianis"?

¹ See Skutsch, 2618.

² Yet there are verses and parts of verses in Livy, verses consciously made or unconsciously allowed by him, a thing worse than an intentional quotation or unconscious reminiscence.

All this leads Vahlen naturally to consider (lxiv) certain views put forth by Wölfflin (Rh. Mus. 50 (1895). 152) and the latter's pupil, Mr. S. G. Stacey (Archiv 10. 17 ff.). Wölfflin, he says, "non sanæ cupiditati versus Ennii ex Livio recuperandi sua auctoritate novum fervorem addidit"; struck by the non-prose word-order in Livy 9. 41. 18 et sicubi est certamen, scutis magis quam gladiis geritur res, and remembering that Ennius had written

pellitur e medio sapientia, vi geritur res,

he concluded that Livy had derived a fragment of a hexameter (*geritur res*) from Ennius.

To this Vahlen objects as follows: (1) if we pronounce rightly (*gêritur rés*), we have no dactylic swing at all; (2) there are many parallels in Livy to the word-order which caught Wölfflin's eye; indeed, the postposition of *res* is a Livian fad.

Wölfflin's view was adopted and expanded by his pupil, Mr. Stacey (lxiv). In his doctoral dissertation Mr. Stacey laid stress on the "Livianæ orationis poeticus color"; finding a certain mode of expression both in Livy and in the fragments of Ennius, or in Livy and in some of the other poets, especially Vergil (imitator Ennianus), he held that these modes of expression were originated by Ennius. Such argument, says Vahlen, is fallacious. We need first of all, he continues, to compare Livy with Livy himself, with the utmost care and acumen; only thus shall we be able to determine just what is Livian, just what is foreign to his style (the brief discussion above of the erroneous stress laid by Wölfflin on the occurrence of *geritur res* as a terminal phrase in Livy will show what Vahlen means here). Again, to infer from two known facts a third *unknown* fact or idea is a procedure which is "seminator . . . multorum inanium et incredibilium": why, pray, does it follow that, merely because Livy and Vergil have a given expression, both derived it from Ennius?¹

¹ I fear that Vahlen is here not quite just. Wölfflin and Stacey remind us carefully of Vergil's indebtedness to Ennius; this makes their line of study far less palpably absurd than Vahlen represents it to be. It happens that the year which saw the publication of the book under review witnessed the issuance by the same publishers of Norden's monumental edition of Aeneid VI. Norden was strongly disposed to accept the views of Wölfflin and Stacey; he repeatedly mentions Mr. Stacey's paper with commendation. In my review of Norden's book (A. J. P. XXVII 71-83) I discussed this whole matter (pages 76-77). I was at that time not familiar with Vahlen's views,

Verrius Flaccus's relation to Ennius is now considered (lxv ff.). He "non exiguam partem Ennii carminibus tribuit". To dogmatize here is difficult, since we have to deal now, not with Verrius's work itself, but with epitomes of it made by two men living in widely sundered periods. Yet Vahlen is convinced that Verrius read and excerpted Ennius for himself. To Festus go back many verses of the *Annales* and of some tragedies (lxvi). The *Annales* are cited by books, and always—save once—in the order of the books¹ (cf. e. g., 172. 1 Ennius libro VI . . . et libro XVI; 194. 14 Ennius in libro II . . . ; item in libro V . . . ; item in libro VIII. The exception is 220. 25 Ennius libro XVI . . . et in libro VIII).² We may assume, says Vahlen, that Verrius himself had cited the *Annales* in this way.

Further, in Festus the tragedies are cited by their *names*, after the *Annales*, but in no settled order. Only twelve or thirteen in all are cited; the total number of quotations is not large. Again, whether he quotes from the *Annales* or from the plays, Festus usually cites "singulos versus . . . , plenos illos quidem numeris, sed sententia saepe non absoluta" (lxvii); fifty times, more or less, he quotes thus from the *Annales*. Often what he quotes is but a dependent clause. His method of quotation from the tragedies is the same (lxix). Yet, complains Vahlen, rightly, such passages have been repeatedly 'emended', with consequent misinterpretation.³

as outlined above. But a careful consideration of the points at issue had left me decidedly sceptical, on grounds differing from those advanced by Vahlen. Skutsch, 2616, however, is much impressed by Norden's efforts to extract fresh bits of Ennius from Vergil (he does not mention Wölfflin or Stacey). But his enthusiasm here is in large degree nullified (though he does not realize this) by a remark made in 2615, to the effect that certain phrases in Catullus 64 cannot be taken as evidence of Ennian influence on Catullus because such phrases "haben jetzt die römische Poesie so durchsetzt, dass der Ennianische Ursprung vergessen ist". These words give pretty clearly the argument in my review of Norden's book referred to in the text above.

¹ This agrees, I may note, with Nonius Marcellus's usual method of citation; see my review of Marx's edition of Lucilius, A. J. P. XXIX 478-482, especially 481, and the references there to Lindsay's Nonius Marcellus's Dictionary of Republican Latin.

² It would be easy to suggest that in Festus VIII is an error for XVII.

³ Nonius Marcellus, too, cites in this fashion; see, e. g., Lindsay's edition of Nonius (1903), I. xxxviii-xxxix, and my review of Norden's *Aeneid* VI in A. J. P. XXVII 77.

Assuming now, as Vahlen does, with good reason, I think, that these modes of citation were copied by Festus from Verrius, we shall see that Verrius's way of citing Ennius was widely different from Cicero's or Varro's; see above, pages 19-23. The later scholar, we see, was far more exact (more modern, if you will, in his exactness) not merely than the litterateur Cicero, but than the doctissimus Romanorum himself.

Paulus Diaconus uses a very different method. He names Ennius often, but nowhere does he give the title of a tragedy or the number of the book from which he is quoting. When he gives verses not found in Festus he often combines with them explanatory glosses (lxxi).

In one passage (Praef. to Book 9. 16) Vitruvius speaks reverently of Ennius. Valerius Maximus, Phaedrus, Velleius show no particular knowledge of the poet (lxxii, lxxiii). By Nero's time Ennius's fame had waned so much that Seneca makes light of him in various places (but then, let us note with Vahlen, he held Cicero in no great esteem), and Persius laughs at him (lxxiii-lxxv). Pliny the Elder gives us some new fragments (lxxvi). Silius Italicus admired Ennius greatly (lxxvi: see 12. 393 ff.); Statius, too, valued him (lxxvii). But Martial (the apostle of the passing moment, I might call him) naturally held him rather cheap (5. 10. 7, 11. 90. 5).

Quintilian's famous judgment of Ennius in 10. 1. 88 contains a mixture of "veneratio" and "despicientia" (cf. 1. 8. 8, 10).¹ He cites verses or parts of verses from the *Annales* not infrequently; commonly, however, these are known to us from other sources. Besides, he usually does not name the *Annales* or even Ennius himself. The tragedies he very seldom cites. In one place, however (9. 3. 26), he gives us valuable information concerning the theme of one of Ennius's *Saturae* (lxxviii-lxxix).

After Quintilian's time Ennius's fame steadily diminished. In the age of the Antonines, however, given as it was to archaism, his memory was inevitably revived (lxxx). In Fronto, Gellius and Apuleius we have many passages of importance from him. In Fronto's letters and those of the Caesars to him Ennius frequently appears (lxxxi-lxxxiii). Gellius shows the greatest

¹ Cf. Skutsch, 2618: "Die Verstösse gegen seine Lektüre bei Martial . . . und bei Quintilian . . . sind wohl bessere Zeichen der Zeit als die Imitationen bei Silius und Statius".

reverence for him, and cites him repeatedly, giving important additions to our stock of fragments.¹ Being a painstaking grammarian Gellius, usually, in citing the *Annales*, gives the book; at the least he tells us that he is citing from the *Annales*. The tragedies, too, he cites often, and accurately, giving regularly the name of the play involved. Finally, in 2. 29, "*De saturis Ennianis egregie meritis est*" (lxxxiii-lxxxvi).

This last matter Vahlen discusses in detail on pages cxi-ccxiii, a passage which is, to my mind, in some respects the finest in all this splendid book. Vahlen may well point with pride to the fact that he was the first to see that here we have in very deed and truth genuine fragments of Ennius (see his first edition, lxxxix ff.). In sections 3-16 Gellius is giving what seems to be a prose version, ostensibly his own, of a fable of Aesop about an *avicula cassita* (cf. the comment in §§ 1-2, 17-19). Then, in § 20, he adds: *Hunc Aesopi apologum Q. Ennius in satiris scite admodum et venuste versibus quadratis composuit. Quorum duo postremi isti sunt, quos habere cordi et memoriae operae pretium esse hercle puto* (then follow two verses in trochaic tetrameters). There is nothing, then, in the whole chapter that would naturally lead one to suppose that Gellius had Ennius's verse-translation of the Greek before him in §§ 3-16; indeed, all the implications of the chapter lead away from such a conclusion. It would be easy to charge Gellius with disingenuousness; at the least he has stated the facts carelessly, for, as Vahlen noted, fifty years ago, we have in §§ 3-16 not merely "*color quidam antiquitatis*", in the form of archaisms of vocabulary, forms, and syntax, but no small number of parts of trochaic verses can be detected in Gellius's words as they stand, and others can be got by slight transpositions of words. Hence Vahlen concluded in his first edition that "(Gellius) non tam ex Aesopo sua convertisse quam Ennii carmen secutus contexuisse sermonem videtur". Vahlen gave examples both of these archaisms and of these verse-parts in his first edition; in the later book he strengthens his case by further citations along these lines.

Now, in 1894, I published in *Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler*, 126-171, a paper entitled *Archaism in Aulus Gellius*. I was at that time not familiar at all with Vahlen's

¹ See my discussion of Gellius's attitude toward Ennius, in *Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler* (1894), 132-133.

Ennius, and so was quite unaware of what he had said about Gellius 2. 29. But I could not fail to note that there were numerous archaisms in this short chapter. In a footnote I give references to places in my paper in which I discussed archaisms in this chapter.¹ To this phase of Gellius's words no one could

¹ See Drisler Studies, 143-144, s. v. *crastini*; 144, s. v. *luci* (*primo luci*); 146, s. v. *fervit*; 159, s. v. *necessum*; 166, s. v. *nidulari*. *temperi* in § 11 should probably be added.

Some archaisms of syntax occur in the chapter (matters of syntax were not handled in the paper to which I have referred).

In § 6 we have *dum . . . iret cibum pullis quaesitum*. There seems some warrant for regarding the use of the first supine with a direct object as in Gellius's time an archaism (see Schmalz,⁴ page 465; Draeger 2. 857-865, especially § 608). Other examples, some of them striking, in Gellius are 3. 13. 2; 6. 3. 7, 44 (in this chapter Gellius has before him, directly or indirectly, a speech of Cato Censor); 9. 15. 3; (10. 6. 2); 10. 19. 3; 12. 1. 2, 9; 14. 6. 1, 5; 16. 5. 9; 16. 11. 6; 18. 5. 3. For examples of the supine without an object in Gellius see 6. 14. 8; 12. 13. 3. It is to be noted, however, that Rodolf Frobenius, in a dissertation on *Die Syntax des Ennius* (Nördlingen, Beck, 1910), page 67, finds only three examples of this usage (supine with object) in Ennius: our passage, and Ann. (272), 348.

Schmalz, page 565, § 325, holds that, after the classical period, *cum* causal, adversative, and concessive appears exclusively with the indicative till we come to Commodianus (so too Draeger 2. 680). Yet it is to me very difficult to see, naturally, anything but causal force (assuming that a *cum*-clause ever has causal force) in Gell. 2. 29. 1 *Aesopus . . . sapiens existimatus est, cum . . . praecepit et censuit*; 6. 3. 25 *dignus . . . laude est cum . . . ingenue ac religiose dicere visus est . . . quod sentiebat et . . . flexit et transtulit* (in this chapter, we noted above, Gellius had Cato Censor before him); 11. 8. 4 *Ne tu . . . nimium nugator es cum maluisti culpam deprecari quam culpa vacare*; 12. 12. 4 *ἄκοινονόητοι homines estis cum ignoratis*. Considering Gellius's deliberate use of archaisms it seems to me not worth while to seek to explain away the apparent causal force in these examples (this *could* be done in 2. 29. 1, but in the other examples the tense in the main clause makes this difficult indeed).

In § 8 we have these words: *Haec ubi ille dixit et discessit*. Schmalz, page 497, § 244, characterizes such sentences with *atque* as "ausschliesslich plautinisch mit Nachahmung bei Gellius". Compare Gellius 17. 20. 4 *Haec verba ubi lecta sunt atque ibi Taurus mihi inquit*. For examples in Plautus see Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum*, s. v. *atque* 16, page 179. The Plautine examples show only *atque*; Gellius has one example each of *atque* and *et*.

In § 7 we have *fac amicos eas et roges*. The word-order is noteworthy: see Vahlen's note, page 208. The nearest parallels are Terence Ad. 917 *tu illas abi et traduce*, and Plautus Am. 32 *propterea pacem advenio et ad vos adfero* (but here the text is disputed). Phrases involving a form of *ire* followed by *et* and a form of another verb occur several times at least in Gellius, e. g. 2. 29. 11 *quin potius imus et oramus*; 14. 2. 23; 20. 10. 5. The usage is

be blind. I saw also clearly enough that in reality throughout this chapter Gellius had had before him Ennius (see page 144, s. v. *crastini*). But, as said above, it had been reserved for Vahlen to detect in Gellius parts of Ennius's verses, by the simple process of reading Gellius aloud. Without a change of a letter, said Vahlen, we get trochaic rhythm in the following: "*ét manus iam póstulare*;¹ *méssim hanc nobis ádiuvent; státim dicto oboédiant; it diés et amici nállí eunt; fiet nunc dubió procul; nón metetur nêque necessumst hódie uti vos auíferam*". By slight emendations he derived the following: "*vós modo hoc advértite: si quíd dicetur dénuo; út iam statim próperet inque aliúm sese asportét locum, alia*".

On these phrases I desire to make one comment. Vahlen twice holds that the *a* in *statim* was long in Ennius. In a footnote to ccxii he refers to his note on Aiác. 1 (= Scén. 17). There he cites Nonius 393. 13 *statim* producta prima syllaba a stando perseveranter et aequaliter significat (quotations follow from Plautus, Terence, Ennius, Afranius). Vahlen then adds: "De prosodia vocis, non de significatione, Nonius videtur falli: cf. Ritschelii opp. iv, pp. 274 sqq." But if Nonius was wrong about the prosody, two of Vahlen's examples cited above cease to be perfect verses or parts of verses.² But, under the circumstances, we should not expect throughout perfect verses or parts of verses.

I am not quite sure, even after repeated reading of Vahlen's discussion, whether he regarded his list of verse-parts in our Gellius passage as complete. However, I shall add some others which I seem to have detected: *Avícula est parva, nómen est cassíta; filium adulescéntem; operámque mutuám dent* (though here word-accent and ictus less clearly coincide); *Háec ubi ille*

common in Plautus: see Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum*, under *co(ire)*, B, 2 (entire), p. 503; also *ibid.*, 3 (entire), pp. 503-504, where we have examples of *ire* followed by *atque* or *que* and the forms of another verb; p. 528, under *β*, p. 529 under *ϑ*.

¹ In passing I wish to compare with the Ennian-Gellian phrase in § 7, *videsne . . . haec ematuruisse et manus iam póstulare*, Lucan 1. 28-29, *horrida quod dumis multosque inarata per annos/Hesperia est desuntque manus póstcentibus arvis . . .*

² On *statim* see Palmer on Plaut. Am. 239; Müller, 224. Neither from the two places in Plautus where the word occurs (Am. 239, 276) nor from Terence Ph. 790 can it be shown positively that the *a* is long. Lindsay, however, *The Latin Language*, page 556, accepts "O. Latin *státim*".

dixit et discēssit; dōminus (inquiunt) misit quī amicos rogēt, uti luce oriēte/vēniant et metānt (read *quī amicos*: defective verses, to be sure, but still the trochaic swing is marked); *māgnam partem cēssatores sūnt; quin pōtius imus et cognatos ādfinesque nōstros oramus; hōc pulli pavēfācti matri nūntiant; sine metu ac sine cūra sint; frumētum nosmetīpsi manibus nōstris cras metēmus; tempus ēst cedendi et ābeundi; (fiet nunc dubio procul) /quōd futurum dixit.* All these additional examples are won without alteration of the text.

To Apuleius alone we owe our knowledge of the Hedyphagetica, as well as the distich (Ann. 62-63) which gives the names of the twelve gods. He cites also a verse of the Thyestes and words of Iphigenia. It appears, then, that he knew the Annales and the tragedies; indeed, says Vahlen, we may readily believe that he "suam orationem colore Enniano distinxisse".

After the time of Gellius and Apuleius Ennius was for a season forgotten, but from the age of Constantine to the end of the reign of Theodosius I, an age of grammarians and of "artium scriptores", he is often mentioned, especially by Nonius Marcellus (lxxxix ff.). Nonius gives us very much from the older writers in general, but "praeter ceteros Ennii carminibus praecipuam et fructuosam operam dedit". From him we derive many new fragments; usually he cites full verses, "nonnumquam sententias plenius quam opus erat perscribens . . ." He gives also, in citing, not merely the poet's name, but the title of the play or the book of the Annales or the Saturae from which he is quoting. Sometimes he uses a quotation from Ennius under different lemmata; on the other hand he often fails to employ in his treatment of a given word an Ennius example of whose existence we have knowledge now from other sources. The long and intricate discussion of these and kindred points is summed up on xcv, with the following results. To Nonius alone we owe most of our knowledge of the Saturae; from him alone we gain what we have of the Ambracia and of the comedies Pancratiastes and Cupuncula. He was ignorant of the Euhemerus and of the Hedyphagetica, perhaps also of the Sota. Of the tragedies he does not use the Alexander and the Iphigenia; in general, however, he used the tragedies more than he did the Annales (contrast the practice of Festus: see above, p. 26). He derived much of his material from the grammarians, particularly Festus and Gellius, perhaps also Varro; "tamen nihil futilius est (de

Ennio loquor) quam credere velle Nonium ad grammaticos et huius generis scriptores potissimum excerptendos se dedisse. Qui si hoc volebat, de Ennii Alexandro et Iphigenia multa discere ex Festo, de Iphigenia multa ex Gellio potuit . . . Quodsi qui tamen affirmare malent Nonium maximam partem glossarum cum exemplis ex nescio quibus glossariis abstulisse, nonne mirum esset, non alios quoque grammaticos sive priores Nonio sive posteriores eosdem fontes adiisse ex iisque hausisse? Quod quia factum non esse apparet, maneat hoc Nonium Ennii carmina et libros studiose pertractasse, hoc est ad eum modum quem veteres omnino huic rei operam dare consueverunt".¹ This discussion and this summary throw interesting light on the much vexed question of Nonius's sources.

Nonius's immediate successors give us little of Ennius, however; Donatus is more fruitful than they (xcvi), but less so than Nonius. Servius again is "unus de locupletissimis de Ennio auctoribus", though even he passed over much that he might have used from Ennius (cii-ciii); further, "ubi Ennius memoratur, non semper primo quo poterat loco, nedum omnibus quibus poterat aut debebat afferri". In his commentary on the *Aeneid*, which he wrote first, says Vahlen, he cites many verses

¹I note briefly that to some of these questions Lindsay, *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary of Republican Latin*, returns a different answer. On page 7 (first full paragraph) and repeatedly in the notes, pages 10 ff., he suggests that readers of Nonius, recalling a quotation from an earlier passage in Nonius, entered it later, where, using the same lemma, the lexicographer supplemented his previous treatment of a word. On page 101 Lindsay agrees with Vahlen in general concerning Nonius's methods of work, holding that "Nonius himself read through the texts or at least the marginal annotations of the texts". Nevertheless he implies, what he nowhere, so far as I have noticed, specifically says, that Nonius owed his quotations from Ennius rather to glossaries or to other authors—e. g. Gellius—than to firsthand study of Ennius himself. He credits Nonius with possessing but a single volume of Ennius, containing the *Hectoris Lytra* and the *Telephus*, in that order, and perhaps other plays; see pages 8, 116. In his text-edition of Nonius, 3. 941-943, he gives a long list of passages quoted by Nonius from Ennius. There is one unfortunate result of all this, in that we have in Nonius no long sequences of citations from Ennius, such as we have from other authors, e. g., Plautus, given in strict accordance with the numerical order of the citations in their original setting (see Lindsay, *op. cit.*, *passim*, but especially pages 35-36, 88 ff.; see also above, page 26, n. 1). The editor of the fragments of Ennius is thus deprived of what might have been a very real help; see again my review of Marx's *Lucilius*, A. J. P. XXVIII 481-482.

from the *Annales*; once only he names the *Annales*, once only he adds the number of the book; elsewhere he gives merely the poet's name, using various methods of citation. He does not cite freely from the plays; once he names the *Iphigenia*, but commonly he merely attaches the poet's name to his citation.

Of most importance, however, in Servius for our purposes are rather "(quae) quaedam generatim afferunt ad res ab Ennio compositas pertinentia" (civ). This sentence Vahlen explains thus: "Dico talia: Aen. I. 20 'audierat' a Iove aut a fati . . . et perite 'audierat': in Ennio enim inducitur Iuppiter promittens Romanis excidium Carthaginis . . . Versus Ennii non attulit, sed significat quid actum sit apud Ennium in concilio deorum, quaeque ibi Iuppiter promiserit, ea vult Iunonem Vergilianam audivisse . . .". So again in his note on Aen. I. 281 "ne nunc quidem versum Ennii afferre voluit, sed sententiam indicare, quae fortasse pluribus verbis exposita erat. Videmus Servium attendere si quid est in Ennii annalibus quod convertere ad interpretandam Vergilii compositionem liceat". "Eaque omnia quae huius generis sunt unius Servii beneficio nituntur". More examples of all this follow on civ-cv.

Most of the hexameters cited by Servius in notes on the *Aeneid* as from Ennius are unknown from other sources; many of these, again, come from Daniel's Servius. Not full verses are cited, but full thoughts, whether these take less or more than one verse. Though Servius errs at times in his citations of Plautus, Terence, etc., Vahlen thinks he is generally right in his quotations from Ennius (cv-cvi). On pages cvi-cviii Vahlen discusses in detail certain modes of citation, apparently, from Ennius in the notes on the *Aeneid*, which, if not rightly understood, will greatly mislead the student.

The commentary on the *Eclogues* gives us just two "*frustula Enniana*", of two words each, whose place in Ennius cannot be determined. The notes on the *Georgics* are richer in *Enniana*; the mode of citation, again, from the *Annales* differs from that used in the commentary on the *Aeneid*, for here, though some verses are cited merely by Ennius's name, most are referred to a definite book (cix-cx). Citations from the plays are very rare in this commentary.

On pages cx-cxiii Vahlen discusses the *Enniana* to be found in the *Scholia Vergiliana* (*Bernensia* and *Veronensia*) and in the

Commentary on the Eclogues and the Georgics ascribed to M. Valerius Probus.

This brings us to Macrobius (cxiii ff.). Once again Ennius is falling into disfavor, for in Sat. I. 4. 17, Servius, about to cite him, says, by way of preface, Ennius, nisi cui videtur inter nostrae aetatis politiores munditias respuendus (cf. 6. 3. 9; 6. 9. 9). In the first books of the Saturnalia we have but a few citations from Ennius, widely scattered; "a sexto autem Saturnalium libro totum *θύλακον* versuum Ennianorum excutere coepit", because "in sexto quanta pars carminum Vergilii ad scriptores Romanos superioris aevi redeat explanare studuit. Inter quos Ennius principem locum obtinet". What he purposes to do he sets forth in 6. 1. 7. Then in §§ 8-24 follow a list of Vergil's borrowings from Ennius; we get throughout complete verses (or pairs of verses) from Ennius, from the Annales, but not always complete sense. If more than one citation from Ennius is given in a single section, these are given in the order of the books; so in § 9 we have citations from the first, the third and the tenth books; in § 17 we have citations from Books 4 and 17. If we view §§ 15-21 together, we find citations running thus: from Books 1, 3, 4 (and 16 in § 17), 6, 7, 8, 17. Section 22 shows passages from Books 6, 8, 17.¹ Most of these verses, furthermore, we owe to Macrobius alone (cxiv-cxv).

In 6. 2. 1 Macrobius declares his intention nunc locos locis componere . . . ut unde formati sint quasi de speculo cognoscas. In § 16 he comes to Ennius; he cites some passages from the Annales, some from the tragedies and the Scipio. We get now, naturally, passages of two or more verses; all these we owe to Macrobius alone. Finally, in §§ 30-32, without citation of definite verses, he indicates various passages in which Vergil was deeply indebted to Naevius and to Ennius. Here again Macrobius is our sole authority. In 6. 3, in setting forth verses which Vergil might well enough have derived from Homer, though they had been used by Roman poets before him, he cites more Enniana. See further cxvi-cxvii. Vahlen sums up by declaring that Macrobius "inter meritissimos de Enni memoria grammaticos referri par (est)".

On pages cxviii-cxxii Vahlen discusses the attempts that have been made to find Enniana in Claudianus; on pages cxxii-cxxiv

¹ See above on Verrius Flaccus's and Nonius's mode of citation, p. 26. Cf. also p. 32, n. 1, at end.

Jerome and Augustine come in for mention ; so also Priscian and Isidorus (cxxiv-cxxix). Priscian cites very often from the *Annales*, sometimes too from the tragedies. He cites generally full verses, giving a complete thought. He gives also not merely the poet's name, but the title of the work and the number of the book. Frequently, too, he is our sole source for the verses he quotes. Vahlen believes (cxxvi) that Priscian read and excerpted Ennius for himself. Isidorus, finally, cites by the poet's name alone, without title of work or number of book.

Not content with having traced the vestigia Ennii thus far Vahlen brings together (cxxviff.) a few references to Ennius in the days after Isidorus, though he declares that he did not regard it as his duty "*Ennii memoriam etiam per medii aevi quod vocatur tempora persequi*". Then comes a discussion of the various editions of Ennius, older and later, and, finally (cxxxvii-cxliv), an account of the *Novae Editionis Subsidia*, that is, of the authoritative editions of the various authors whose names recur so often in the *testimonia* of our book (see above, page 3).

Here I must stop for the present. Some day, perhaps, I shall recur to the subject, by writing a commentary on the fragments, and discussing in connection therewith the second part of Vahlen's *Prolegomena*, entitled *De Libris Ennianis*. I had planned to include the latter discussion in the present paper, but the studies required by this article have made it entirely clear that the rest of the *Prolegomena* can be best treated only in connection with a virtual commentary on the fragments.

Let me close, then, as I began, by an expression of my profound admiration of the enormous industry and patience and of the wondrous scholarship displayed throughout this book. I am aware that at many points I have ventured to question the soundness of the conclusions based by Vahlen on the facts he adduces. That result, I submit, was inevitable ; in view of the scantiness of our fragments, after all, it is most hazardous to base conjectures and inferences, at least of certain kinds, upon them ; inevitably, therefore, any careful and lengthy examination of this book would seem to emphasize unduly points of difference between the author and the reviewer.

CHARLES KNAPP.